

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed February 20, 2007. Herein, claims 37-38, 50-51, 54-55, 60 and 62 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 34, 39, 41, 48, 52, 53, 56, 59 and 63 have been amended. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

#### ***Double Patenting***

Claims 34-67 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of the obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,489. Applicant has submitted a terminal disclaimer to obviate the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 34-67.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant notes that claims 38-43, 51-53, 60, and 62-63 have been rejected as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicates that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has amended independent claims 34, 48 and 56 have been amended to include limitations from claims 37-38, 50-51 and 62, respectively. Claims 39, 41, 53 and 59 have been placed into independent form to include the limitations of base claim 34, 34, 48 and 56, respectively. Applicant respectfully requests that independent claims 34, 39, 41, 48, 53, 56 and 59 and all claims that depend therefrom are in condition for allowance.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 34-37, 41, 44-50, 54-49, 61, and 64-67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Pinder (U.S. Patent No. 6,105,134). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established. However, in light of the amendments set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that these grounds for rejection are moot. Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments if further prosecution is desired.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding §102(e) rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.